



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/718,695	11/24/2003	Yukiharu Miyamura	03-35 PUS	3226
21254	7590	06/01/2005	EXAMINER	
MCGINN & GIBB, PLLC 8321 OLD COURTHOUSE ROAD SUITE 200 VIENNA, VA 22182-3817			DINH, PHUONG K	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2839	

DATE MAILED: 06/01/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

AK

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/718,695

Applicant(s)

MIYAMURA ET AL.

Examiner

Phuong KT Dinh

Art Unit

2839

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 15 March 2005.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-20 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-3, 5-12 and 14-20 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☒ Claim(s) 4 and 13 is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. Claims 1, 5, 7, 10, 14, 16, 18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Miyasyo (U. S. Patent 6,201,689) in view of Admitted Prior Art (APA)

3. Regarding claims 1 and 10, Miyasyo discloses a display apparatus including a first connecting terminal 18 provided in a first end portion on of a connecting cable and a second connecting terminal 14 provided in a second end portion of the connecting cable and electrically connected to a terminal of a drive circuit board and the display apparatus comprising: a third connecting terminal 16b provided in the second portion of the connecting cable for establishing electric connection to a connector provided on a replacement drive circuit board. Wherein the third connecting terminal is insertable into the connector on the replacement drive circuit board. Miyasyo discloses the claimed invention except a conductive adhesive. APA discloses a conductive adhesive at b, see figure 2. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Miyasyo to provide the conductive adhesive as taught by APA so as to easy to connection. For claims 8 and 17, since one could provide out slots to separate the terminals they meet the claim limitation since the claims only require terminals able to be separated, not that they be separated.

Art Unit: 2839

4. Regarding claims 5 and 14, Miyasyo discloses the third connecting terminal 16b is provided on the inward side of the second connecting terminal in the second end portion of the connecting cable.

5. Regarding claims 7 and 16, Miyasyo discloses the third connecting terminals 16b are arranged in parallel in plural in individual corresponding with plurality of the second connecting terminals lined up in the second portion of the connecting cable.

6. Claims 2-3, 11-12 and 19-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Miyasyo (U. S. Patent 6,201,689) in view of Admitted Prior Art (APA) and further in view of Hanato (U. S. Patent 5,414,220).

7. Regarding claims 2-3, 11-12 and 19-20, Miyasyo and APA disclose the claimed invention except for the third connecting terminal in a connector-coupling terminal to be coupled to the connector on the replacement drive circuit board by means of insertion and use of a reinforcing plate. Hanato use a reinforcing plate at 5 to enable connection by insertion into a socket 20. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Miyasyo and APA to provide use a reinforcing plate at 5 to enable connection by insertion into a socket 20 as taught by Oughton so as to enable to easier connection.

8. Claims 8 and 17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Miyasyo (U. S. Patent 6,201,689) in view of Admitted Prior Art (APA) and further in view of Oughton, Jr. (U. S. Patent 4,251,683).

9. Regarding claims 8 and 17, Miyasyo and APA disclose the cable terminals are not detachable. Oughton discloses terminals separated by slits. It would have been

Art Unit: 2839

obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Miyasyo and APA to provide the terminals separated by slits as taught by Oughton so as to lessen chance of terminal shorting.

Allowable Subject Matter

10. Claims 4 and 13 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Response to Arguments

Page 11, part A, applicant argues that Miyasyo and APA would not have been combined and even if combined the combination would not teach or suggest each every element of the claimed invention. The Examiner respectfully disagrees. The thermocompression bonding terminal and assistropic conductive bond are only alternative ways to fix a flexible cable to a rigid printed circuit board producing basically similar results.

Page 12, applicant argues that neither Miyasyo nor the APA nor any combination thereof teach or suggests wherein the third connection terminal is insertable into the connector on the replacement device circuit board. The Examiner respectfully disagrees. Miyasyo adapter by itself, since "wherein the third connection terminal is insertable into the connector on the replacement device circuit board" defines no structural limitation, Miyasyo device with part 16a removed is capable of such insertion.

Page 14, Part B, Miyasyo and APA combination would not have been further combined with Hanato to form the invention of claims 2-3 and 11-12. The Examiner respectfully disagrees. For claim 2, the rejection proper since Miyasyo cable end with 16a removed is capable of such insertion. Hanato is not critical but is added to show a manner of such use.

Page 16, Part C, Miyasyo and APA combination would not have been further combined with Oughton from the invention of claims 8 and 17. The Examiner respectfully disagrees. For claim 8 rejection is proper, since the cable and terminals are

Art Unit: 2839

separable by formation of slots. That is all that claim 8 requires and Oughton is used only to show manner of formation of such slots.

Conclusion

11. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Phuong KT Dinh whose telephone number is 571-272-2090. The examiner can normally be reached on 8 -5, 5 days a week.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, TC Patel can be reached on 571-272-2098. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Art Unit: 2839

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Phuong Dinh', is written over a horizontal line.

Phuong Dinh]
May 25, 2005.

Phuong KT Dinh
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 2839